

PTO/SB/21 (09-08)

Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0851-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paper Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>	Application Number	09/812,628	RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER JAN 08 2007
	Filing Date	March 20, 2001	
	First Named Inventor	Lawrence, David	
	Art Unit	3692	
	Examiner Name	Liversedge, Jennifer L.	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	17	Attorney Docket Number	G08.126

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to (TC) <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) / <i>1/6/07</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Credit Card Authorization for \$500, and Acknowledgement Postcard <i>1/6/07</i>
Remarks _____		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm Name	Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC		
Signature	<i>R. P. Calhoun</i>		
Printed name	Randolph P. Calhoun		
Date	January 8, 2007	Reg. No.	45,371

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO at facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on the date shown below.			
Signature	<i>R. P. Calhoun</i>		
Typed or printed name	Randolph P. Calhoun	Date	January 8, 2007

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

In you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 08 2007

Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellant: Lawrence

Application Serial No.: 09/812,628

Filing Date: March 20, 2001

For: AUTOMATED ACCOUNT RISK
MANAGEMENT

) Confirmation No.: 1331

) Group Art Unit: 3628

) Examiner: Jennifer Liversedge

) **AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF**

) Attorney Docket No.: G08.126

) **PTO Customer Number 28062**

) Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC

) 50 Locust Avenue

) New Canaan, CT 06840

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted
to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for
Patents at fax number (571) 273-8300 on the date noted
below:

Dated: January 8, 2007 By: 

Randolph P. Calhoun

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellant hereby submits an Appeal Brief to appeal to the Board of Patent
Appeals and Interferences from the decision of the Examiner in the Final Office Action
mailed June 21, 2006 (the "Final Office Action"), rejecting claims 1 - 20.

01/09/2007 TL0111 00000034 09812628

01 FC:1402

500.00 0P

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 08 2007

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The present application is assigned to GOLDMAN SACHS & CO., 85 Broad Street, New York, NY 10004

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

No other appeals or interferences are known to Appellant, Appellant's legal representative, or assignee, which will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 – 20 are pending in this application. Claims 1 – 17 and 20 were previously presented; claims 18 and 19 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof; and claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 1 – 20 stand rejected and are now being appealed.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments are pending or were filed subsequent to the Final Office Action.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Appellant claims a method and computerized system to manage risk related to opening a client account related to, for example, management of financial assets and investments. The claimed method and system may be used to facilitate analysis and quantification of a reputational risk related to opening of the client account where the reputational risk relates to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity. (See Abstract and paragraph [0006] of Patent Application Publication US

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

2003/0138408 corresponding to the present application, hereinafter the "Pat. App. Pub.")

Independent claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method to manage risk related to opening a client account, including receiving digital information into a computer system relating to a client seeking to open the client account. (See FIGS. 2 and 3; and Pat. App. Pub. paragraph [0030], ln. 1 – 6). The method also includes structuring the received digital information according to a risk quotient criteria associated with a reputational risk of opening the client account, wherein the reputational risk relates to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity. The structuring of the information may include, for example, allocating and formatting the received information to appropriate fields of a database based on the type of information received. A weight or ranking may be assigned or attached to the risk quotient criteria to indicate an importance of the risk quotient associated with the reputational risk of opening the account. Based on the structured information and the weight associated with the risk quotient criteria a risk quotient is calculated, according to claim 1. The calculated risk quotient may provide an indication of the risk associated with opening the account. Weighted risk scores for a number of risk categories may be summed to calculate a total risk score or the risk quotient. (See the flow diagram of FIG. 3 and the discussion related to same at Pat. App. Pub., paragraphs [0031] – [0033]) The calculated risk quotient may be used to facilitate management, analysis, and other processes related to opening the account by generating a suggestion in response to the calculated risk quotient. (See FIG. 3 and Pat. App. Pub., paragraphs [0035] – [0036]).

Independent claim 16 relates to a computerized system for managing risk associated with opening a client account including a computer server accessible with a network access device via a communications network and executable software stored on the server and executable on demand. The server and software are operative to implement the processes hereinabove regarding claim 1. Support for claim 16 is provided in FIG. 2 that depicts an exemplary computer system, the flow

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

diagram of FIG. 3, and the detailed discussion provided in Pat. App. Pub., paragraphs [0030] – [0036]).

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 08 2007

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The rejection of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, 11, and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0135457 to Stewart et al. (hereinafter, Stewart).

The rejection of claims 4, 10, and 16 - 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart, and in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0143686 to Greene et al. (hereinafter, Greene).

The rejection of claims 12, 13, and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart, and in further view of Dictionary of Economics by Wiley (1995) from www.xreferplus.com (hereinafter, xreferplus).

ARGUMENT

I. Applicable Law

In rejecting claims under 35 USC § 103, the Examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by presenting evidence that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed invention. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to modify a reference may flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved, see Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc., 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1630 (Fed. Cir. 1996), although “the suggestion more often comes from the teachings of the

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

pertinent references," In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1456 (Fed. Cir.1998). The range of sources available, however, does not diminish the requirement for actual evidence. That is, the showing must be clear and particular. See, e.g., C.R.Bard Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 USPQ2d 1225, 1232 (Fed. Cir.1998), cert. denied, 119 S. Ct. 1804 (1999). A broad conclusory statement regarding the obviousness of modifying a reference, standing alone, is not evidence. Thus, when an Examiner relies on general knowledge to negate patentability, that knowledge must be articulated and placed on the record. See In re Lee, 277 F.3d 1338, 1342-45, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

As will be evident from the following detailed discussion, the cited and relied upon Lent and Walker fail to disclose or suggest that for which the Examiner cites and relies upon them to disclose. Furthermore, the Examiner fails to provide any reasoning articulated in the references for concluding the claims are obvious.

II. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, 11, and 20 are Patentable over Stewart, and in further view Greene under 35 USC, 103(a)

Regarding the rejection of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, 11, and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0135457 to Stewart under 35 USC 103(a) in the Final Office Action, Appellant notes that the Non-Final Office Action dated June 21, 2006 cited and relied upon Stewart for all of the claimed aspects except for an explicit disclosure of the claimed reputational risk relating to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity. The Final Office Action stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that reputation risk related to one's professional standing would be a factor in making the determination of opening an account. As an example, the Examiner provides the scenario of a client known to have embezzled funds through a previous account (i.e., criminal and/or legal risk).

The cited and relied upon Stewart discloses a system and method for electronically establishing a demand deposit account. In particular, Stewart discloses a system and method wherein a customer applies for the demand account on-line and

provides personal information to an institution as necessary for the institution to determine the product(s) for which the customer is approved. Stewart states an automated system acquires predictive information, interacts with established debit, credit, and other databases, and either approves or denies the customer's application for a demand deposit account. (See Stewart, paragraph [0007], ln. 6 – 13) Stewart specifically discloses the use of debit and credit databases. No mention or suggestion is made in Stewart regarding Appellant's claimed risk quotient criteria associated with reputational risk of opening a client account, wherein the reputational risk relates to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity.

The Stewart system includes "an authorization system 60 [that] is used to validate consumer identity and to assess customer risk, unique financial product usage, demographic knowledge at a household-level-assessment, and cross-sell qualification. ... The authorization system 60 uses a logistic-regression model to predict the likelihood of financial (and particularly debit) account-related abuse. The authorization system 60 uses customer data such as the customer's social security number, driver's license number, and address to calculate the risk that an account will be closed for abuse at a later date." (emphasis added) (See Stewart, paragraph [0020], ln. 1 – 14) Stewart also discloses a fraud identification system (70) that predicts the likelihood of identity manipulation and predictive fraud modeling, and helps to identify inconsistent, inaccurate, and fraudulent information provided by the customer. (See Stewart, para. 0042)

Stewart discloses a demand account approval process that explicitly considers a credit or financial risk and a fraudulent identity risk. Specifically, the credit risk relates to a credit rating of the customer and the fraudulent identity risk relates to "inconsistent, inaccurate, and fraudulent information provided by the customer". (See Stewart, paragraphs [0020], ln. 19 – 21, and [0040], ln. 9 – 12) Stewart also discloses searching lists published by the United States Treasury Department Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) to maintain OFAC compliance.

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

It is thus clear that the factors explicitly disclosed and considered in Stewart specifically and directly relate to the customer's credit and financial standing, as well as the customer's identity and strict compliance with OFAC regulations.

Appellant respectfully agrees with the Examiner's admittance that Stewart does not disclose "wherein said reputation relates to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity." However, Appellant disagrees with the Examiner's broadly stated conclusion that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that reputation risk related to one's professional standing would be a factor in making the determination of opening an account. (See Final Office Action dated July 21, 2006, page 3, ln. 16 – page 4, ln. 1)

Appellant respectfully submits that the reasons provided in the Advisory Action dated August 31, 2006 for not allowing the application are also factually incorrect. For example, the Examiner states, "[S]tewart discloses the use of reputation in considering account opening. The consideration of credit score and credit rating are part of reputational risk."

Appellant disagrees with the Examiner's definition of reputational risk on the basis that it is not supported by the cited and relied upon Stewart or any other substantiated evidence. Additionally, the Examiner's alleged definition of the claimed reputational risk is contrary to Appellant's clearly claimed and disclosed meaning of the term "reputational risk". As a matter of fact, Appellant states reputational risk relates to harm that a financial institution may suffer regarding its professional standing in an industry (Specification, page 2, ln. 9 – 10) and claims reputational risk relates to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity. Appellant also discloses, "[C]redit risk relates to factors that can adversely affect a party's ability to borrow money." (See Specification, page 2, ln. 3 – 4) The data and analysis to identify credit risk is not the same as the data and analysis needed to identify the claimed reputational risk. The credit score and credit rating factors disclosed by Stewart clearly relate to a credit risk.

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

Thus, it is clear, as a matter of fact, that Stewart fails to disclose the claimed reputational risk and the motivation or basis of the Examiner's conclusion that Stewart suggests the claimed reputational risk is erroneous.

Accordingly, Appellant submits that claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, 11, and 20 are patentable over Stewart under 35 USC 103(a).

III. Claims 4, 10, and 16 – 19 are Patentable over Stewart, and in further view of Greene under 35 USC. 103(a)

Claims 4, 10, 14, and 16 - 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Stewart, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number US 2002/0143686 A1 to Greene et al. (hereinafter, Greene).

Appellant further submits that Greene fails to address or overcome the failings of Stewart. As clearly shown above regarding claims 1 and 20, Stewart fails to disclose or suggest the claimed reputational risk. Accordingly, even combining Stewart with Greene (as alleged in the Office Action but not agreed with as suggested or feasible by Appellant) would not render claim 16 obvious.

Appellant respectfully submits that claims 4, 10, 14, and 17 – 19 depend from allowable base claims and are therefore also allowable. Accordingly, Appellant submits that claims 4, 10, 14, and 16 - 19 are patentable over Stewart and Greene under 35 USC 103(a).

IV. Claims 12 - 13 and 15 are Patentable over Stewart as applied to claim 1, and further in view of xreferplus under 35 USC. 103(a)

Claims 12 - 13 and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over Stewart as applied to claim 1, and further in view of xreferplus.

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

Appellant respectfully submits that claims 12 - 13 and 15 depend from an allowable base claim, namely claim 1. For at least this reason, Appellant submits that claims 12 - 13 and 15 are also allowable.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 20.

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 08 2007

CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully suggests that the rejections of claims 1 – 20 are improper and request that the rejections be reversed. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner or the Board has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, kindly contact the undersigned using the information provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

January 8, 2007

Date



Randolph P. Calhoun
Registration No. 45, 371
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-5985

Appendix A - Claims
Appendix B - Evidence
Appendix C - Related Proceedings

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

Appendix A - Claims

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 08 2007

The following is a complete copy of the claims involved in the appeal:

1. (Previously presented) A computer-implemented method to manage risk related to opening a client account, the method comprising:

receiving digital information into a computer system relating to a client seeking to open the client account;

structuring the received digital information according to a risk quotient criteria associated with a reputational risk of opening the client account, wherein said reputational risk relates to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity;

associating a weight with the risk quotient criteria;

calculating a risk quotient based on the structured information and the weight associated with the risk quotient criteria; and

generating a suggested action in response to the calculated risk quotient.

2. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising storing data comprising the received information, the risk quotient, and the suggested action in a risk quotient criteria database; and

generating a due diligence report based upon the stored data.

3. (Previously presented) The method of claim 2, wherein the due diligence report comprises a history of inquiries made relating to the client account and actions taken responsive to the risk quotient.

4. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 further comprising :

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

presenting a graphical user interface to a network access device;

displaying questions relating to the client account on the graphical user interface; and

receiving information into the computer system responsive to the questions displayed.

5. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the received information is received from an source of electronic data.

6. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the suggested action is responsive to the received information.

7. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the suggested action is directed towards reducing at least one of a financial, legal, regulatory, and reputational risk associated with the client account.

8. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the suggested action comprises blocking an opening of the client account.

9. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the suggested action comprises notifying an authority concerning the received information.

10. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the received information is received electronically from an external database.

11. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising performing a calculation on the risk assumed by a financial institution as represented by the risk quotient.

12. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising aggregating a plurality of the risk quotients in order to calculate a total risk quotient representative of a total risk assumed by a financial institution.

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

13. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising calculating an average risk quotient based on a plurality of the risk quotients.

14. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein at least a portion of the received information is received in a pre-structured format.

15. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the risk quotient is calculated by multiplying a numerical value representative of a risk associated with the risk criteria times a numerical value indicative of a category weighting.

16. (Previously presented) A computerized system for managing risk associated with opening a client account, the system comprising:

a computer server accessible with a network access device via a communications network; and

executable software stored on the server and executable on demand, the software operative with the server to cause the system to:

receive digital information relating to the client account;

structure the received information according to risk quotient criteria associated with areputational risk of opening the client account, wherein said reputational risk relates to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity;

associate a weight with the calculated risk quotient criteria;

calculate a risk quotient based on the structured information and the weight associated with the risk quotient criteria; and

generate a suggested action in response to the risk quotient.

17. (Previously presented) The computerized system of claim 16, wherein the software is further operative to cause the system to:

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

store data in a risk quotient criteria database, wherein the stored data includes the received information, the risk quotient, and the suggested action; and

generate a due diligence report based upon the stored data.

18. (Original) The computerized system of claim 16 wherein the network access device is a personal computer.

19. (Original) The computerized system of claim 16 wherein the network access device is a wireless handheld device.

20. (Previously presented) Computer executable program code residing on a computer-readable medium, the program code comprising instructions for causing the computer to:

receive digital information into the computer relating to a client account;

structure the received digital information according to a risk quotient criteria associated with a reputational risk of opening the client account, wherein said reputational risk relates to a professional standing in an industry of an account opening entity;

associate a weight with the risk quotient criteria;

calculate a risk quotient based on the structured information and the weight associated with the risk quotient criteria; and

generate a suggested action in response to the calculated risk quotient.

21. (Cancelled)

22. (Cancelled)

FROM

(MON) JAN 8 2007 17:57/ST. 17:53/No. 7516422308 P 17

Patent Application Serial No. 09/812,628
Attorney Docket No. G08.126

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 08 2007

Appendix B - Evidence

This appendix is empty.

Patent Application Serial No. 09/682,787
Attorney Docket No. G07.042

Appendix C - Related Proceedings

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 08 2007

No other appeals or interferences are known to Appellant or Appellant's legal representative which will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Therefore, there are no copies of decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any related proceeding to include herewith.